

### REMARKS

Claims 1 – 16 and 19 - 31 are pending in the present application. Claims 17 and 18 are canceled. Claims 29 – 31 are newly added. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

In section 5 of the Office Action, the abstract is objected to. Applicants are providing a new abstract. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully solicited.

In section 7 of the Office Action, claim 28 is objected to as being in improper form. Applicants are amending claim 28 to address this objection. A withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

In section 8 of the Office Action, claims 1 – 17 and 19 – 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,177,860 to Cromer et al. (hereinafter “the Cromer et al. patent”). The application contains one independent claim, namely claim 1. Applicants are clarifying an aspect of claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Cromer et al. patent.

Claim 1 provides for a method for adaptation of an intelligent unit to a location in a system. The method includes, *inter alia*, associating a configuration device with the location, wherein the configuration device is connected to a coupling location for the intelligent unit in the system.

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a system that employs the method of claim 1. The system includes a configuration device, i.e., a marker 22, situated at a location 2 in the system. In this regard, marker 22 is associated with location 2, and connected to a coupling location for an intelligent unit 12 in the system.

The Cromer et al. patent is directed toward a technique for deploying a computer (Abstract). In this regard, the Cromer et al patent discloses an RFID tag that is part of the computer’s memory space (col. 3, lines 15 – 16), to store configuration information for the computer (col. 3, lines 26 – 27).

In the Cromer et al. patent, the RFID tag is situated in the computer that is to be configured. The Cromer et al. patent does not describe the RFID tag as being situated at, or associated with, a location at which the computer is to be installed, and does not describe the RFID tag as being connected to a coupling

location for the computer. Consequently, the Cromer et al. patent does not disclose **associating a .configuration device with the location**, wherein the configuration device is **connected to a coupling location** for the intelligent unit in the system, as recited in claim 1. Therefore, the Cromer et al. patent does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 – 16 and 19 – 27 depend from claim 1. By virtue of this dependence, claims 2 – 16 and 19 – 27 are also novel over the Cromer et al. patent.

Claim 17 is canceled. As such the rejection thereof is rendered moot.


Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 17 and 19 – 27.

As mentioned above, Applicants are clarifying an aspect of claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Cromer et al. patent, and amending claim 28 to address an objection with regard to its form. Additionally, Applicants are amending claims 1 – 7, 9, 14 – 16, 21, 26 and 27 for one or more of (a) ensuring an antecedent basis for terms, (b) improving form, (c) improving grammar, or (d) deleting recitals that do not appear to be necessary for patentability. Applicants are adding claims 29 - 31 to preserve recitals that are being deleted from other claims.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

February 27, 2008  
Date

Respectfully submitted,

  
Charles N.J. Ruggiero  
Reg. No. 28,468  
Attorney for the Applicants  
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.  
One Landmark Square, 10<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Stamford, CT 06901-2682  
Tel: 203-327-4500  
Fax: 203-327-6401